

REMARKS

This REPLY is in response to the Office Action dated April 14, 2011.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

In the Office Action dated April 14, 2011, Claims 1-6, 9-10, 13-14, 18, 21, 24, 27-31 and 33-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Radley-Smith, Philip John (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0030595, hereinafter "Radley-Smith") in view of Radley-Smith, Philip John (U.S. Patent No. 7,152,989, hereinafter "Radley-Smith 2").

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendments

No claims are amended by this Reply. Reconsideration of the Application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated April 14, 2011, Claims 1-6, 9-10, 13-14, 18, 21, 24, 27-31 and 33-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Radley-Smith (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0030595) in view of Radley-Smith 2 (U.S. Patent No. 7,152,989).

Claim 1

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claim 1 in view of the following remarks.

In the final Office Action, it was asserted that Radley-Smith discloses an input device that receives input of a gesture to move a first content from a first display device of the plurality of display devices to a second display device, wherein the processor corresponding to the first display device interprets a direction to move the first content from the first display device based on the gesture, determines the destination display device to which the first content is to be moved and the plurality of display devices, establishes a peer-to-peer connection between the first display device and second display device. It was further asserted in the final Office Action that Radley-Smith discloses wherein each display device include a corresponding plurality of a processor and memory system to control each corresponding display device.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Radley-Smith appears to disclose a bracelet that displays information that extends over substantially the whole of the normally visible outer surface of the bracelet. (Paragraph [0027]). As described in paragraph [0028] of Radley-Smith, the display device extends over three or more segments of the bracelet. As

recited in Claim 1, an input device receives input of a gesture to move a first content from a first display device of the plurality of display devices to a second display device. As further recited in Claim 1, the first content of the first display device is propagated to the second display device. Applicant respectfully submits that Radely-Smith does not appear to display content in this manner. For example, Applicant respectfully submits that Radely-Smith discloses that the displayed information area extends over substantially the whole of the normally visible outer surface of the bracelet, while Claim 1 recites displaying the entire content on a first display, then propagating that content from the first display to a second display based on a gesture. For example, in order to display information on a first display, then to propagate that information to be displayed on a second display, each display device would need to include a corresponding processor and memory system to control each corresponding display device. The processor corresponding to the first display device determines the destination display device to which the first content is to be moved, based on the direction indicated by the gesture and the position of the plurality of display devices, wherein the destination display device is the second display device. Thus, displaying and propagating content in the manner in Claim 1 would require that each display device have a processor, present the entire content and control and propagate the content to a different display device. Applicant respectfully submits that displaying the entire content, and controlling the propagation of the content from one display device to a different display device, where each display device presents the entire content, is substantially different from merely displaying information over the entire visible surface of connect display panels, as disclosed in Radely-Smith.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that although Radely-Smith 2 appears to disclose that each device (e.g., bracelet) can be powered by a single battery, and a single quartz crystal and/or chip can be employed for all the units (e.g., the display segments), Radely-Smith 2 does not appear to disclose that each display device includes a corresponding plurality of a processor and memory system to control each corresponding display device, as recited by Claim 1. Specifically, Radely-Smith 2 appears to disclose a single processing unit shared by the various segments of the bracelet, while Claim 1 recites that each display device includes a corresponding plurality of a processor and memory system to control each corresponding display device. Moreover, Claim 1 recites that the device establishes a peer-to-peer connection between the first display device and the second display device, and propagates the first content of the first display device to the second display device using **the peer-to-peer connection**. As disclosed in Radley-Smith 2, although the bracelet, **when considered as a single entity**, may

be able to receive and transmit information from and to other entities, the **individual segments of the bracelet do not communicate with each other**. Additionally, the individual segments do not establish peer-to-peer connections with each other and then use that connection to exchange information with each other. Applicant respectfully submits that neither Radely-Smith nor Radely-Smith 2 disclose these features when considered alone or in combination.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 13, 31 and 43

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claims 5, 13, 31 and 43 have been similarly amended to more clearly recite the embodiments therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 5, 13, 31 and 43 are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4, 6, 9-10, 14, 18, 21, 24, 27-30 and 33-42

Claims 2-4, 6, 9-10, 14, 18, 21, 24, 27-30 and 33-42 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1, 5, 13 or 31. These claims are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that the claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the remarks provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Request for Interview

In the event the above remarks fail to place the case in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests the opportunity to interview with the Examiner at their convenience, and prior to issuance of a subsequent Office Action, to assist in expediting prosecution.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 7, 2011

By: /Adam T. Hipp
Adam T. Hipp
Reg. No. 60,344

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928
Customer No. 23910